



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

MICHAEL J. FARGANO

Group Art Unit: 2684

111 Reply Brief
4/6/04
a. 1.

Serial No.: 09/295,288

Examiner: Philip Sobutka

Filed: April 20, 1999

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD INTEGRATING CALL DETAIL
RECORDS FOR MULTIPLE NETWORK ENVIRONMENT

Attorney Docket No.: 1610 (USW 0487 PUS)

RECEIVED

APR 01 2004

Technology Center 2600

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a reply brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed
January 29, 2004.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this paper, including all enclosures referred to herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage pre-paid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

3/25/04

Date of Deposit

Jeremy J. Curcuri
Name of Person Signing

Signature

Remarks

Mirza et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,616) fails to describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic configured to generate a wireless call detail record, and the call detail record control logic at the operations support system receiving the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic, receiving the wireline call detail record from the switching control logic and combining the wireline and wireless call detail records into an integrated call record.

Mirza describes a method for integrated billing and an integrated wireline-wireless system. Mirza uses an advanced intelligent network (AIN) service control point (SCP) 102 to generate wireless and wireline bills, and does not describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic and operations support system in combination with the other recited limitations. The Examiner has directed appellant's attention to the drawing and col. 3, l. 13 - col. 4, l. 40 of Mirza. Mirza describes AIN SCP 102 performing billing functions for calls in wireless section 200 (Col. 3., ll. 35-37.)

In applying the primary reference, Mirza, the Examiner has pointed out general teachings of billing. However, the applied reference fails to specifically describe or suggest the claimed invention as recited in the claims.

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states that Mirza teaches the wireless infrastructure in Figure 1, item 201 and the mobility management interface sending wireless call details, as explained in col. 3, ll. 33-55. The Examiner further states Mirza describes switching logic in Figure 1 as item 101 and described in col. 3, ll. 18-32, and describes a support system which receives the wireless and wireline call details and combines them in an integrated call record at box 30.

The Examiner goes on to note that Mirza describes the broad concept of combining wireless and wireline call details to generate integrated call records and makes note

of Mirza's title and abstract. The Examiner further states that appellant's claim refers only to "control logic" managing and gathering and generating details in records and that the claim does not prohibit the logic being combined into a single process.

In the appeal brief, appellant noted that the reference to the drawings is for illustration only. However, this emphasis was only to point out that it is the claims that are believed to be patentable and the references to the drawings were only to facilitate understanding. The fact that the reference to the drawings is only for illustration does not necessarily mean that the claims lack structure.

What is critical here, is what is recited by the claim. Claim 1 recites a system for integrating call detail records for a multiple network environment. The system comprises access manager control logic, switching control logic, and an operations support system. The access manager control logic is connected to a wireless network. The access manager control logic is configured to generate a wireless call detail record in response to placement of a wireless call from a call source having an identity. The switching control logic is connected to a wireline network, and is configured to generate a wireline call detail record. The operations support system has call detail record control logic configured to receive the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic, and to receive the wireline call detail record from the switching control logic. The call detail record control logic of the operations support system is further configured to combine wireless and wireline call detail records that correspond to the same customer into an integrated call record.

Claim 1 recites a number of specific structures as well as a number of specific functions. Certain functions are performed by certain structures in the claimed combination as in claim 1. For example, the access manager control logic, by its nature, controls access. It is this same access manager control logic that is further limited in that it is configured to generate a wireless call detail record in response to placing of the wireless call from a call source having an identity. This aspect as well as others come together to form the claimed combination set out in claim 1 which is believed to be patentable.

The Examiner states even if as appellant alleges the functions were proportioned into different physical structures, the logic would still perform the functions as outlined in the instant claims. Claim 1 recites a specific collection of elements operating to perform a function in a specified way to achieve integrated call detail records. One aspect of this recited combination is that it is the access manager control logic that is connected to a wireless network and that is configured to generate a wireless call detail record in response to placement of a wireless call from a call source having an identity. In contrast, Mirza uses an advanced intelligent network (AIN) service control point (SCP) 102 to generate bills, and does not describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic and other features in the combinations set forth in the claims.

For the reasons given above and in the appeal brief, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are patentable. The final rejection of claims 1-20 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL J. FARGANO

By Jeremy J. Curcuri
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 3/25/04

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351